

1                                   **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
2                                   **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

3   ANGELA WILLIAMS, et al.,

4                   Plaintiffs

5   v.

6   STEVE SISOLAK, et al.,

7                   Defendants

Case No.: 2:21-cv-01676-APG-VCF

**Order Granting, in part, Motions to Seal**

[ECF Nos. 233, 239]

8           The parties have filed motions to seal declarations and exhibits in support of their  
9 respective briefs. ECF Nos. 233, 239. The parties filed the subject material under seal. ECF Nos.  
10 232, 238. However, the Protective Order entered in this case does not permit the wholesale  
11 sealing of entire documents. Rather, it requires that protected material “be redacted from all  
12 public filings . . . .” ECF No. 230 at 9. That is consistent with the general rule that the public has  
13 a right to inspect and copy judicial records. *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d  
14 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006). A party seeking to seal a judicial record bears the burden of  
15 overcoming this strong presumption. *Id.*

16           The parties sealed the entirety of their filings even though there appears to be  
17 comparatively very little protected information contained in those documents. *See, e.g.*, ECF No.  
18 232 at 1 (index of exhibits); ECF No. 232-1 at 9-22 (Protective Order). Only those portions that  
19 contain specific reference to protected information may be filed under seal. The remainder that  
20 does not contain protected information must be filed as publicly-accessible documents, with  
21 redactions of protected information.

22           I will allow the filings to remain sealed so the parties may confer about what, if any,  
23 portions should be sealed. The parties are to then file on the public docket redacted versions of

1 the filings by January 24, 2025. If the parties cannot reach an agreement on what should be  
2 sealed, or if parties believe that a document is so replete with protected information that  
3 redaction is too difficult, they may file a motion seeking permission to do so, which must include  
4 an explanation of reasons. *See* ECF No. 230 at 10.

5 I THEREFORE ORDER that the documents filed at **ECF Nos. 232 and 238 will remain**  
6 **sealed.**

7 I FURTHER ORDER the parties to confer about what, if any, portions of sealed  
8 documents should remain sealed and then file on the public docket redacted versions of the  
9 filings by January 24, 2025. If the parties cannot reach an agreement, or if parties believe that a  
10 document is so replete with protected information that redaction is too difficult, they may file a  
11 motion seeking permission to do so, which must include an explanation of reasons.

12 DATED this 3rd day of January, 2025.

13   
14 \_\_\_\_\_  
15 ANDREW P. GORDON  
16 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23